

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

VIRAL BHAGAT,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ANUJA SHARAD SHAH,

Defendant.

24-CV-1424 (VEC) (RFT)

ORDER

ROBYN F. TARNOFSKY, United States Magistrate Judge:

The Court received an undocketed communication from pro se Plaintiff, which is attached as Exhibit A to this Order.

Given the subject matter of the request—Plaintiff’s concern that Defendant had filed his tax return on the docket without an accompanying motion to seal—I believe that it was appropriate for Plaintiff to email chambers in these circumstances. I therefore treat Plaintiff’s email as an application to have his tax returns on the docket, which Defendant submitted, filed under seal. Plaintiff’s tax returns shall remain sealed on the docket pending a determination on Plaintiff’s application.

DATED: June 6, 2025
New York, NY

SO ORDERED.



ROBYN F. TARNOFSKY
United States Magistrate Judge

Exhibit A

From: [Viral Bhagat](#)
To: [Anu Shah](#); [Tarnofsky NYSD Chambers](#)
Cc: [Pro Se Filing](#); caproni_nysdchambers@nysd.uscourts.gov
Subject: Re: 1:24-cv-01424-VEC-RFT Bhagat v. Shah
Date: Thursday, June 5, 2025 12:48:20 PM

CAUTION - EXTERNAL:

Judge Caproni and Judge Tarnofsky,

I respectfully request that the Court take immediate action regarding the Defendant's latest filing, titled "*Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Rule 72(a) Motion to Compel Meta Production.*"

In this submission, the Defendant has publicly filed **my 2024 tax return** as Exhibit 3, without any motion to seal. This document contains highly sensitive personal and financial information and was produced during discovery with the understanding that it would remain confidential, consistent with standard practice and the Court's Individual Practices.

This is not the first time the Defendant has engaged in this type of misconduct. In fact, she **previously committed the same violation** in her filing at **ECF 307**, where she also publicly filed confidential tax and financial information without permission. Despite that clear breach, she has now repeated the same conduct — in knowing disregard of the rules and the confidentiality of discovery material.

I respectfully ask that the Court:

1. **Immediately strike and seal Exhibit 3** from the public docket;
2. Strike or reject the full opposition filing due to inclusion of protected and improperly disclosed materials;
3. **Admonish the Defendant** for repeated violations of discovery and filing rules; and
4. Consider issuing **sanctions** under Rule 26(c), Rule 37, and the Court's inherent authority to deter further misconduct.

If the Court prefers that I file a formal motion to strike or a proposed order, I am happy to do so promptly.

-Viral Bhagat

On Thu, Jun 5, 2025 at 9:13 AM Anu Shah <anushah0821@gmail.com> wrote:
Filing : Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Rule 72(a) Motion to Compel Meta Production
Name: Anu Shah, Pro se Defendant
Exhibit 1: Plaintiff's told Meta that He Knows Dordi since 2021/22
Exhibit 2: Oops feedback form with the policy details

Exhibit 3: Plaintiff tax return 2024

Exhibit 4: Meta's objection to the deposition subpoena details Plaintiff's law suits against Meta and his agreement with the production in April 2025.

CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated outside the Judiciary. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.